

A. Claims 1, 15, 29, and 36 Contain Patentable Subject Matter

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fail to disclose or render obvious, at least, an image forming device including receiving unit that receives a print request including printing data; a memory that stores the printing data; and a controller which enables editing of the printing data previously stored in the memory of the image forming device, as recited by claim 1, and similarly by claims 15, 29, and 36.

Specifically, the Office Action relies on Fig. 9, and its corresponding description, of Nakajima as allegedly curing the admitted deficiencies of Kurozasa with respect to these features. While the Office Action points to Steps S104 and S105 of Nakajima, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to take into consideration the surrounding disclosure.

Nakajima describes a print request is input (S100), the print request is converted to print control code (S102), and added-value information is inserted into the print control code (S103). The print control code (including the added-value information) is then stored in the spool file (S104). Once the editing instruction is received (S105), the data controller reads out the print code from the spool file and supplied it to the data edit controller (S106). The edit controller then performs editing as shown in Fig. 10 (S107).

The editing that is described in Fig. 10 only describes the editing of templates, color, density, position, and magnification, all of which are added-value information in the print control code. The edit controller of Nakajima does not edit the print request received at S100, nor does Nakajima disclose that the received print request (at S100) is stored in a memory. Nakajima merely describes storing the print control code containing the added-value information and editing the added-value information contained in print control code

Accordingly, Nakajima does not cure the deficiencies of Kurozasa as it does not disclose or render obvious, at least, an image forming device including receiving unit that

receives a print request including printing data; a memory that stores the printing data; and a controller which enables editing of the printing data previously stored in the memory of the image forming device, as recited by claim 1, and similarly by claims 15, 29, and 36.

B. Claims 9, 10, 23, 24, and 34 Contain Patentable Subject Matter

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fails to disclose or render obvious an image forming device including wherein the controller enables editing of the printing data if the printing data satisfies a predetermined condition, as recited by claim 9, and similarly by claims 10, 23, 24, and 34.

Specifically, the Office Action relies on steps S101-S111 of Fig 9, as well as col. 6, line 56 - col. 7, line 13 of Nakajima as allegedly curing the admitted deficiencies of Kurozasa with respect to these features.

Applicants respectfully submit that Nakajima does not describe any predetermined condition for satisfaction by the printing data as clearly seen by the above description of the process of Nakajima. At the personal interview, Examiner Riley clarified that the recitation of "if an edit instruction is input from, for example, the data input device 5" at col. 5, lines 63-64 of Nakajima can be interpreted as a predetermined condition. However, Applicants respectfully submit that this does not describe a predetermined condition that is satisfied by the printing data. It merely describes that if an editing instruction is input, then editing is done. Nakajima does not describe any sort of comparison of the actual print request with a condition such that it could enable editing based on that comparison.

Accordingly, Nakajima does not cure the deficiencies of Kurozasa as it does not disclose or render obvious an image forming apparatus including wherein the controller enables editing of the printing data if the printing data satisfies a predetermined condition, as recited by claim 9, and similarly by claims 10, 23, 24, and 34.

B. Claims 11, 12, 25, 26, and 35 Contain Patentable Subject Matter

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fails to disclose or render obvious an image forming device including wherein the controller enables editing of the printing data when an information processor which has transmitted the printing data is identical to an information processor which requests the editing of the printing data, as recited by claim 11, and similarly by claims 12, 25, 26, and 35.

Specifically, the Office Action relies on steps S101-S111 of Fig 9, as well as col. 6, line 56 - col. 7, line 13 of Nakajima as allegedly curing the admitted deficiencies of Kurozasa with respect to these features.

Applicants respectfully submit that Nakajima does not describe any comparison between an information processor which has transmitted the printing data and an information processor which requests editing as clearly seen by the above description of the process of Nakajima. Nakajima does not describe any sort of comparison of the print data input device which inputs the print request with the device which requests editing such that it could enable editing based on that comparison. It merely describes that if an editing instruction is input, then editing is done.

Accordingly, Nakajima does not cure the deficiencies of Kurozasa as it does not describe or render obvious an image forming apparatus including wherein the controller enables editing of the printing data when an information processor which has transmitted the printing data is identical to an information processor which requests the editing of the printing data, as recited by claim 11, and similarly by claims 12, 25, 26, and 35.

C. Claims 13, 14, 27, and 28 Contain Patentable Subject Matter

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fails to disclose or render obvious an image forming device including wherein the controller enables editing of the printing data when the user information added to the printing data is identical to user

information input by a user who requests editing, as recited by claim 13, and similarly by claims 14, 27, and 28.

Specifically, the Office Action relies on steps S101-S111 of Fig 9, as well as col. 6, line 56 - col. 7, line 13 of Nakajima as allegedly curing the admitted deficiencies of Kurozasa with respect to these features.

Applicants respectfully submit that Nakajima does not describe any comparison between user information added to the printing data and user information input by a user who requests editing, as clearly seen by the above description of the process of Nakajima. Nakajima does not describe any sort of comparison of user information added to the print request with user information input by a user who requests editing such that it could enable editing based on that comparison. It merely describes that if an editing instruction is input, then editing is done.

Accordingly, Nakajima does not cure the deficiencies of Kurozasa as it does not describe or render obvious an image forming apparatus including wherein the controller enables editing of the printing data when the user information added to the printing data is identical to user information input by a user who requests editing, as recited by claim 13, and similarly by claims 14, 27, and 28.

D. In Sum

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fail to disclose or render obvious each and every feature of claims 1, 9-15, 23-29, and 34-36. As such, claims 1, 9-15, 23-29, and 34-36 are patentable. Dependent claims 2-14, 16-28, and 30-35 are also patentable, at least for their dependencies on any of independent claims 1, 15, and 29, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin R. Davis
Registration No. 64,667

JAO:KRD/nlp

Date: May 27, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
